APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,839	01/22/2002	David S. Parkman	7784-000212	7764

27572	7590	02/23/2006

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER
BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-21* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This is in response to amendment filed on 11/11/05 in which claims 1 and 3-21 are

pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 12 have been considered but are moot

in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 3, 8-10, 12-13, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,014,669 to Slaughter et al in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,625643 to Colby et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813777 to Weinberger et al.

a.   As per claim 1, Slaughter et al teaches a highly- available distributed cluster

configuration database. Furthermore, Slaughter et al teaches a first server that provides a first

service and includes a first configuration database; a second server, connected to said first server,

that provides a second service and includes a second configuration database (See col. 3, lines 63-

65, Cluster configuration database stores data such as configuration parameters and runtime

data), wherein when said first and second servers boot up, said first and second servers compare

said first and second configuration databases (See col. 12, lines 50-55, the copies of the

configuration database on each node are then compared to determine whether each node has a

consistent a copy of the configuration database) . However, Slaughter et al failed to teach

wherein the network is a network for a mobile platform and at least one area distribution box in

communication with said first and second servers', and at least one seat electronics box in

communication with one of said at least one area distribution box, said seat electronics box

operable to provide network access to a user and comparing said first and second configuration

databases after one of powering up and re-booting said first and second servers.

Colby et al teaches a system and method for resource management on a data network.

Furthermore, Colby et al teaches wherein the topology manager synchronizes its database with

the other topology managers when its starts its operation (See col. 6, lines 57-67 and col.. 7 lines

1-6).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate comparing said first and second configuration databases after one of

powering up and re-booting said first and second servers as taught by Colby et al in the claimed

invention of Slaughter et al in order for the topology managers to update their databases and

track completion of operations by the originating topology manager (See col. 6, lines 44-55).

However, Slaughter et al in view of Colby et al fails to teach wherein the network is a network

for a mobile platform and at least one area distribution box in communication with said first and

second servers', and at least one seat electronics box in communication with one of said at least

one area distribution box, said seat electronics box operable to provide network access to a user.

Weinberger et al teaches wherein the network is a network for a mobile platform and at least one area distribution box in communication with said first and second servers', and at least one seat electronics box in communication with one of said at least one area distribution box, said seat electronics box operable to provide network access to a user (See col. 10, lines 36-62).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the network is a network for a mobile platform and at least one area distribution box in communication with said first and second servers', and at least one seat electronics box in communication with one of said at least one area distribution box, said seat electronics box operable to provide network access to a user as taught by Weinberger et al in the claimed invention of Slaughter et al in view of Colby et al in order to facilitate the distribution of system power, combined video/audio data and service data to the various audio/video unit (See col. 21, lines 1-33).

b.   As per claim 12, Slaughter et al teaches a highly-available distributed cluster configuration database. Furthermore, Slaughter et al teaches a method or initializing a network comprising: connecting first and second servers; powering on said first and second servers; providing a first service with said first server that includes a first configuration database (See col. 3, lines 63-65, Cluster configuration database stores data such as configuration parameters and runtime data); providing a second service with said second server that includes a second configuration database; comparing said first and second configuration databases (See col. 12, lines 50-55, the copies of the configuration database on each node are then compared to determine whether each node has a consistent a copy of the configuration database) when said

first and second servers boot up and complete self-testing (See col.5, lines 25-30). However,

However, Slaughter et al failed to teach wherein the network is a network for a mobile platform

and at least one area distribution box in communication with said first and second servers', and at

least one seat electronics box in communication with one of said at least one area distribution

box, said seat electronics box operable to provide network access to a user and comparing said

first and second configuration databases after one of powering up and re-booting said first and

second servers.

Colby et al teaches a system and method for resource management on a data network.

Furthermore, Colby et al teaches wherein the topology manager synchronizes its database with

the other topology managers when its starts its operation (See col. 6, lines 57-67 and col.: 7 lines

1-6).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate comparing said first and second configuration databases after one of

powering up and re-booting said first and second servers as taught by Colby et al in the claimed

invention of Slaughter et al in order for the topology managers to update their databases and

track completion of operations by the originating topology manager (See col. 6, lines 44-55).

However, Slaughter et al in view of Colby et al fails to teach wherein the network is a network

for a mobile platform and at least one area distribution box in communication with said first and

second servers', and at least one seat electronics box in communication with one of said at least

one area distribution box, said seat electronics box operable to provide network access to a user.

Weinberger et al teaches wherein the network is a network for a mobile platform and at

least one area distribution box in communication with said first and second servers', and at least

one seat electronics box in communication with one of said at least one area distribution box,

said seat electronics box operable to provide network access to a user (See col. 10, lines 36-62).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein the network is a network for a mobile platform and at least one

area distribution box in communication with said first and second servers', and at least one seat

electronics box in communication with one of said at least one area distribution box, said seat

electronics box operable to provide network access to a user as taught by Weinberger et al in the

claimed invention of Slaughter et al in view of Colby et al in order to facilitate the distribution of

system power, combined video/audio data and service data to the various audio/video unit (See

col. 21, lines 1-33).

c.   As per claims 3 and 13, Slaughter et al in view of Colby et al and further in view of

Weinberger et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Slaughter et al

teaches wherein if said first and second configuration databases do not match, one of said first

and second configuration databases having an older update date is replaced with the other of said

first and second configuration databases having a newer update date (See col. 8, lines 20-30).

d.   As per claims 8 and 18, Slaughter et al in view of Colby et al and further in view of

Weinberger et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Slaughter et al

teaches a third server, connected to said first and second servers, that provides a third service and

includes a third configuration database (See col. 3, lines 39-67).

e.   As per claims 9 and 19, Slaughter et al in view of Colby et al and further in view of

Weinberger et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Slaughter et al in

fails to teach wherein said mobile platform is an aircraft and one of said first, second and third

servers is a web server.

Weinberger et al wherein said mobile platform is an aircraft and one of said first, second

and third servers is a web server (See col. 7, lines 12-26)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein said mobile platform is an aircraft and one of said first, second

and third servers is a web server as taught by as taught by Weinberger et al in the claimed

invention of Slaughter et al in view of Colby et al in order to facilitate the distribution of system

power, combined video/audio data and service data to the various audio/video unit (See col. 21,

lines 1-33).

f.   As per claims 10 and 20, Slaughter et al in view of Colby et al and further in view of

Weinberger et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Slaughter et al in

Colby et al failed to teach wherein said mobile platform is an aircraft and one of said first,

second and third servers is a media server.

Weinberger et al wherein said mobile platform is an aircraft and one of said first, second

and third servers is a media server (See page 1, paragraph [0009]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein said mobile platform is an aircraft and one of said first, second

and third servers is a media server as taught by Weinberger et al in the claimed invention of

Slaughter et al in view of Colby et al in order to facilitate the distribution of system power,

combined video/audio data and service data to the various audio/video unit (See col. 21, lines 1-

33).

5.   Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,014,669 to Slaughter et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No.

U.S. Patent No. 6,625643 to Colby et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813777 to

Weinberger et al and further in view of U.S. Patent application No. 2003/0014526 to Pullara et

al.

a.   As per claims 4 and 14, Slaughter et al in view of Colby and further in view of

Weinberger et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Slaughter et al in

view of Colby and further in view of Weinberger fails to teach wherein a first of said first and

second servers to boot up and complete self-testing is designated a primary server.

Pullara et al teaches wherein a first of said first and second servers to boot up and

complete self-testing is designated a primary server (See page 3, paragraph [0038]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein a first of said first and second servers to boot up and complete

self-testing is designated a primary server as taught by Pullara et al in the claimed invention of

Slaughter et al in view of Colby and further in view of Weinberger et al in order to provide

redundancy for a client network session (See page 1, paragraph [0003]).

6.   Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,014,669 to Slaughter et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No.

U.S. Patent No. 6,625643 to Colby et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813777 to

Weinberger et al and further in view of U.S. Patent application No. 2003/0014526 to Pullara et al

as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,852,724 to Glenn, II et al.

a.   As per claims 5 and 15, Slaughter et al in view of Colby and further in view of

Weinberger et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Slaughter et al in

view of Colby and further in view of Weinberger failed to teach wherein said primary server

tracks network status.

        Glenn, II et al teaches a system and method for server backup. Furthermore, Glenn, II et

al teaches wherein said primary server tracks network status (See col. 9, lines 3-5).

        It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein said primary server tracks network status as taught by Glenn, II

et al in the claimed invention of Slaughter et al in view of Colby and further in view of

Weinberger et al and further in view of Pullara et al in order to provide fail over capability from

a primary server to a secondary server (See col. 1, lines 8-10)

7.   Claims 6-7 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,014,669 to Slaughter et al in view of U.S. Patent Application

No. U.S. Patent No. 6,625643 to Colby et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813777 to

Weinberger et al as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,852,724 to

Glenn, II et al.

a.   As per claims 6 and 16, Slaughter et al in view of Colby and further in view of

Weinberger et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Slaughter et al in

view of Colby and further in view of Weinberger fails to teach to teach wherein if said first

server does not boot up and complete self-testing, said second server performs a subset of said

first service.

Glenn, II et al teaches a system and method for server backup. Furthermore, Glenn, II et

al teaches wherein if said first server does not boot up and complete self-testing, said second

server performs a subset of said first service (See col. 9, lines 15-39).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein if said first server does not boot up and complete self-testing,

said second server performs a subset of said first service as taught by Glenn, II et al in the

claimed invention of Slaughter et al in view of Colby and further in view of Weinberger et al in

order to provide fail over capability from a primary server to a secondary server (See col. 1, lines

8-10)

b.   As per claims 7 and 17, Slaughter et al in view of Colby and further in view of

Weinberger et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Slaughter et al in

view of Colby and further in view of Weinberger fails to teach wherein if said second server

does not boot up and complete self-testing, said first server performs a subset of said second service.

Glenn, II et al teaches a system and method for server backup. Furthermore, Glenn, II et al teaches wherein if said second server does not boot up and complete self-testing, said first server performs a subset of said second service (See col. 9, lines 15-39).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein if said second server does not boot up and complete self-testing, said first server performs a subset of said second service as taught by Glenn, II et al in the claimed invention of Slaughter et al in view of Colby and further in view of Weinberger et al in order to provide fail over capability from a primary server to a secondary server (See col. 1, lines 8-10).

8.   Claims 11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,014,669 to Slaughter et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. U.S. Patent No. 6,625643 to Colby et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813777 to Weinberger et al as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0027378 to Tennison et al.

a.   As per claims 11 and 21, Slaughter et al in view of Colby and further in view of Weinberger et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Slaughter et al in view of Colby and further in view of Weinberger fails to teach wherein said mobile platform is an aircraft and one of said first, second and third servers is a data transceiver server.

Tennison et al teaches collecting and reporting information concerning mobile assets. Furthermore, Tennison et al teaches wherein said mobile platform is an aircraft and one of said first, second and third servers is a data transceiver server (See page 3, paragraph [0023]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said mobile platform is an aircraft and one of said first, second and third servers is a data transceiver server as taught by Tennison et al in view of Slaughter et al in view of Colby and further in view of Weinberger et al in order to provide remote bi-directional communications (See page 3, paragraph [0023]).

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10.	Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M. Bayard whose telephone number is (571) 272-3878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djenane Bayard

Patent Examiner